



Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA


Physics Division

Presented at the XVth International Conference on Neutrino Physics
and Astrophysics, Granada, Spain, June 8-12, 1992,
and to be published in the Proceedings

Precise Predictions for Neutrino Masses and Mixings

L.J. Hall

August 1992



DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor The Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or The Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or The Regents of the University of California and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory is an equal opportunity employer.

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

August 21, 1992

LBL-32485
UCB-PTH-92/22

Precise Predictions For Neutrino Masses and Mixings • † ‡

Lawrence J. Hall

*Department of Physics
University of California
and
Theoretical Physics Group
Physics Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
1 Cyclotron Road
Berkeley, California 94720*

*This work was supported in part by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00098 and in part by the National Science Foundation under grants PHY90-21139.

†Talk presented at the XVth International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, June 1992, Granada, Spain.

‡In collaboration with S. Dimopoulos and S. Raby.

Written contributions of theoretical talks are often just edited versions of published technical papers, so nobody bothers to read them. Instead of doing this, I will tell you in plain English the motivation and the results of this work.

It is no exaggeration to say that the majority of particle physics experiments are designed to measure either the masses of the quarks and leptons, or their couplings to the W boson. There is no mystery about why this is so: we are most interested in learning the fundamental parameters of the standard model, and 22 out of 27 of these correspond to quark and lepton masses and mixing.* I am not trying to minimize the importance of the 5 parameters of the gauge sector, which can be taken as $\alpha, \alpha_s, G_F, M_Z$ and M_H ; but it is a simple fact that the large majority of the fundamental parameters belong to the flavor sector.

Each of the 27 fundamental parameters is represented in the standard model by a coupling constant. Conventional wisdom in particle physics has it that theory got way ahead of experiment, and consequently became a victim of its own success. What do you do after successfully predicting the existence and masses of the W and Z particles? This masks an important point; the triumph of particle theory was the construction of the standard model, not the understanding of the values of the 27 fundamental coupling constants. The prediction of the Z mass was possible because the four observables $\alpha, G_F, \sin^2 \theta$ and M_Z depend on only three of the fundamental independent couplings, giving a prediction $M_Z^2 = \pi \alpha / \sqrt{2} G_F \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \theta$. The real problem with theory is that it has failed to calculate any of the 27 fundamental coupling constants, while experiments have measured 18 of them. Particle theory has hit a brick wall. It is a victim of its present failures not its previous successes.

I do not know how to construct a fundamental theory which would allow a first principles calculation of coupling constants. Does this mean I have no hope of making predictions? No. It is always possible to obtain predictions by *reducing the number of free parameters*. The Balmer formula provides a superb illustration of this. A large number of observables (the hydrogenic spectral wavelengths) are described by a single free parameter (the Rydberg constant).

*Since this is a Conference on neutrino physics, I will take the standard model to contain the usual minimal field content (no right handed neutrinos), but allow for dimension five operators of the form $\ell_i \ell_j H H$ to generate neutrino masses. Here ℓ_i is a lepton doublet and H the Higgs. The counting includes three phases in the leptonic mixing matrix, but ignores $\bar{\theta}$.

Twenty eight years after this incredibly successful formula was written down, it played a dominant role in leading Bohr to his atomic model in which he could compute the Rydberg, $\mathcal{R} = 2\pi^2 m Z^2 e^4 / h^3$. This crowning achievement was the birth of the quantum theory of atomic structure. It may well be that a predictive scheme for fermion masses, depending on far fewer than the 22 flavor couplings of the standard model, is a prerequisite for the development of a fundamental theory of fermion masses.

Progress has been made in reducing the number of parameters in the gauge sector. In grand unified theories (GUTs) the three independent gauge couplings become related [1]. This implies predictions for the weak scale gauge couplings $g_i(M_W)$, $i = 1...3$, of the form [2]:

$$g_i(M_W) = C_i \eta_i g_G \quad (1)$$

where g_G is the GUT gauge coupling, C_i are numerical group theory constants and the η_i , which are radiative corrections computed with the renormalization group, depend on mass ratios such as M_W/M_G , where M_G is the GUT scale. Let me define the number of predictions of any sector of a theory by

$$\text{Predictions} = (\text{Independent observables}) - (\text{Free parameters}). \quad (2)$$

How many predictions occur in the gauge sector of GUTs? While the C_i are purely numerical group theory constants, the η_i depend on ratios of various mass scales. If there are two or more mass ratios on which the η_i depend, then there are no predictions: together with g_G there are three or more free parameters for the three observables g_i . The only hope is for the maximally predictive possibility that the η_i depend only on the single mass ratio M_W/M_G , in which case there will be one prediction, usually chosen to be the weak mixing angle $\sin^2 \theta$.

There are many possible GUTs which have no new scale other than M_G . How many different predictions for $\sin^2 \theta$ can they give? The answer is just two: .211 without supersymmetry and .233 with weak-scale supersymmetry [3]. What is the accuracy of these predictions? There are GUT/supersymmetric model-dependent corrections which are typically around .002 [4]. Since the standard model is *consistent* with any value of $\sin^2 \theta$ from 0 to 1, I think that it is very

significant that the minimal supersymmetric scheme predicts precisely the experimental value of $.233 \pm .001$. Many people shrug this off, but let's face it, it is significant.

The successful prediction of $\sin^2 \theta$ resulted from requiring a larger symmetry than dictated by experiment. It is well known that this same enlargement of the gauge symmetry can also yield predictions in the flavor sector. Flavor observables at the weak scale, $F_a(M_W)$, can be given by predictions of the form

$$F_a(M_W) = C_a \eta_a \quad (3)$$

where C_a are again purely numerical group theory constants, while the dynamical factors η_a depend on several parameters, including α_s and mass ratios such as M_W/M_G . The first such prediction was for m_b/m_τ [5]. However, we now know that in this case η_a depends on m_t and α_s , leading to uncertainties of 30% and 10% respectively. Hence this successful prediction is much less significant than $\sin^2 \theta$, especially as one successful prediction out of so many flavor parameters is not convincing.

Recently Savas Dimopoulos, Stuart Raby and I have constructed a scheme with only 8 independent flavor parameters [6]: we predict 14 of the 22 quark and lepton masses and mixings.[†] Our scheme is based on two sets of symmetries: an $S(10)$ supersymmetric gauge symmetry and the family symmetry of Georgi and Jarlskog [7]. We have used these two types of symmetries, GUT and family, because they are the only known tools available for obtaining predictive flavor theories, other than just phenomenological guesswork. Others have obtained predictions using GUT and family symmetries. In particular Harvey, Ramond and Reiss [8] studied the Georgi-Jarlskog family symmetry in the context of $S(10)$. However, their theory had a complicated Higgs sector so that only four flavor predictions of the type of equation (3) could be made, and furthermore the η_a were not calculated. Our scheme is by far the most predictive that has ever been written down. It may not be *the* most predictive, and it may not be correct, but it *can* be tested.

What is the level of accuracy of our predictions? This is determined by the experimental uncertainties of the inputs used to determine our free parameters.

[†]In fact since the theory is supersymmetric there is an extra flavor parameter: $\tan \beta$, the ratio of vevs. We predict 14 of the 23 total flavor parameters.

For example we use $\sin \theta_c$, m_c and m_u/m_d as inputs, and these are known only to 1%, 10% and 30% respectively. Hence our predictions have accuracies which are typically 1-30% depending on which inputs they are sensitive to.

Six of our 14 predictions occur in the charged fermion sector. Our scheme may well be probed via the top mass. We are unable to give a very precise determination of m_t because it depends on inputs α_s , m_c and V_{cb} which all have 0(10%) uncertainties. However, we will need to rethink if m_t is outside the range 165 ± 25 GeV. A crucial and definitive test of our scheme will occur if the angles α, β, γ of the unitarity triangle of the KM matrix are accurately determined through CP violating decays of neutral B mesons at a B factory.

The neutrino masses and mixings are completely determined in terms of the charged fermion masses and mixings, with the one exception of the overall mass scale of the neutrino masses. We do not know any way of predicting this scale. As far as we know, this is the first time anything about the neutrino masses and mixings has been predicted using the known quark and charged lepton masses and mixings as input. We predict every element of the 3×3 lepton mixing matrix, and both neutrino mass ratios m_{ν_τ}/m_{ν_μ} and m_{ν_μ}/m_{ν_e} . In constructing our scheme for neutrino masses we have made several assumptions, each motivated by the desire to obtain a maximum number of predictions. The assumptions concern our choice of symmetries and how these symmetries are broken.

Our predictions for neutrino masses and mixings are shown in the table. The 3×3 mixing matrix has been approximated by rotations $\theta_{e\mu}$, $\theta_{\mu\tau}$ and $\theta_{e\tau}$, and we have not shown the effects from CP violation. There are two versions of our scheme, which we label I and II.

In model I $\theta_{\mu\tau}$ is sufficiently large that the Fermilab E531 results imply that $m_{\nu_\tau} \leq 2.5$ eV. This means that it is unlikely that planned neutrino oscillation experiments will be able to detect the neutrino masses of this model. Although the neutrinos are all too light to be the dark matter, the value of $\theta_{e\mu}$ does allow a resolution of the Cl, Kamiokande and Gallex solar neutrino experiments by MSW oscillations, at the 90 % confidence level. Our value of $\theta_{e\mu}$ implies that, as the error bars on the Ga experiments are decreased, a low number of about 50 ± 10 SNU's will result. To test this region of parameter space in the lab would require a long baseline $\nu_\mu \nu_\tau$ oscillation search with sensitivity to smaller mixing

angles than the present proposals.

In model II $\theta_{\mu\tau}$ is just beyond the E531 limits. This is very exciting because it means that the upcoming $\nu_\mu\nu_\tau$ oscillation searches [9] will probe a large range of Δm^2 in this model. In particular if the ν_τ makes a significant contribution to the dark matter in the universe, then O(50) events will be seen and $\sin^2 2\theta_{\mu\tau}$ will be determined to be within 15% of $3 \cdot 10^{-3}$.

Grand unified theories are only interesting if they are testable. The successful weak mixing angle prediction is the first crucial step, but is not sufficient. Observation of proton decay could yield important information about GUT scale physics, but is unlikely to provide a significant numerical test. If the flavor structure of GUTs is simple enough, there can be very many predictions of quark and lepton masses and mixings. This may be the only real hope for definitive progress on GUTs.

	I	II
$\theta_{e\mu}$	$(6.5 \pm .3)10^{-2}$	$.15 \pm .04$
$\theta_{\mu\tau}$	$.081 \pm .008$	$-.027 \pm .003$
$\theta_{e\tau}$	$(5.7 \pm .6)10^{-4}$	$(1.9 \pm 0.2)10^{-4}$
m_{ν_τ}/m_{ν_μ}	208 ± 42	1870 ± 370
m_{ν_μ}/m_{ν_e}	$(3.1 \pm 1.0)10^3$	38 ± 12
$m_{\nu_{\text{mes}}}$	2.5 eV	710 eV

Table

References

1. H. Georgi and S.L. Glashow, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32** 438 (1974).
2. H. Georgi, H. Quinn and S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33** 451 (1974).
3. S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev.* **D24** 1681 (1981);
S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B193**,150 (1981).
4. R. Barbieri and L.J. Hall, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68** 752 (1992).
5. M. Chanowitz, J. Ellis and M.K. Gaillard *Nucl. Phys.* **B135** 66 (1978).

6. S. Dimopoulos, L.J. Hall and S. Raby, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68** 1984 (1992),
*Phys. Rev. D***45** 4192 (1992), LBL preprint 32484 .
7. H. Georgi and C. Jarlskog, *Phys. Lett.* **86B** 297 (1979).
8. J. Harvey, D. Reiss and P. Ramond, *Phys. Lett.* **92B** 309 (1980); *Nucl.*
*Phys. B***199** 223 (1982).
9. L. Di Lella, these Proceedings.

LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720